



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,009	09/24/2003	Yoshinobu Takeyama	242228US2	1795

22850 7590 04/10/2006

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

ELLIS, SUEZU Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2878

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/669,009	TAKEYAMA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Suezu Ellis	2878	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Suezu Ellis. (3) Todd Baker.  
 (2) Thanh Luu. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 06 April 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,3,13,18 and 19.


Identification of prior art discussed: Maeda (US 2001/0028387), Ozaki (US 6,243,124), Fujii (US 5,424,765).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Regarding the non-final office action mailed 3/14/06, the rejection of claims 1 and 13 were discussed but no agreement was reached. With respect to claims 3 and 18, the rejection will be reconsidered. With respect to the rejection of claim 19, applicant argues the phase-locked loop with variable filters is not a matter of design choice, in reference to the specification page 13, lines 4-14, and no agreement was reached..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
 THANH X. LUU  
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required